

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant San Luis Obispo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Amount Requested	\$2,797,000
---	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title Flood Control Zone 1/1A Waterway Management Program Alternative 3a Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,647,369
---	----------------------------	-------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

This Project includes a comprehensive set of actions designed to restore the capacity of the leveed lower three miles of the Arroyo Grande Creek flood channel to increase flood protection to homes, prime agricultural lands, and critical urban infrastructure in the lower Arroyo Grande Creek watershed. This project implements an integrated, watershed approach to flood management through a collaborative and community supported process without unfairly burdening communities, neighborhoods or individuals.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	9/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			42

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Work Plan describes how the proposed project will achieve the goals and objectives of the IRWMP. The appropriate maps and conceptual designs are provided with sufficient detail for 30% level of design, and sufficient detail is provided that the project can be implemented and operated as standalone project. Environmental compliance and permitting work completed-to-date is summarized. Work Plan provides the tabulated overview of the project with abstract and status. However, supporting information for Water Quality Improvement benefits is not discussed and there is inconsistency with estimated imported fill

quantities: The Work Plan indicates 16,300 cubic yards, Task 4b table “Alternative 3a Levee Raise” indicates 14,100 cubic yards.

Budget

The Budget has detailed cost information, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories. The Habitat Enhancement cost of Task 4b, First Year Sediment Removal is \$377,400 and is based on the Engineer’s Estimate of Probable Construction Cost based on 30% design; however, the Engineer’s Estimate is not included as an exhibit. Much of cost of Task 4b, Levee Raise is also based on the Engineer’s Estimate. The application states results of the final geotechnical evaluation (to be completed) could make the levee design more complicated and adds \$20,000 as a contingency, without supporting documentation. The Budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule.

Schedule

The Schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget and is reasonable, but the bid award date for Project construction (May 16, 2012) is not within six months of the anticipated grant award date (October 1, 2011).

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A discussion of the Project’s goals/performance measures is included, as well as a table that includes the appropriate Outcome and Output indicators, Project Goals, Measurement Tools and Methods, and Targets. The table is populated with specific information on 3 overarching goals of the Project: increase channel flood capacity; protect biological resources; and improve the function of flood control facilities. Reasonable targets include: achieving a channel roughness coefficient of 0.04; removing 21,330 cy of sediment deposition; reduction in flood damage claims; elimination of invasive species; and reduced channel maintenance.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this Proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. An inundation map is provided, the estimated probability of flood events is verifiable, and expected damages appear to be more than costs. Total Net Present Value of costs is \$7.77 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$34.251 million. No water supply benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Only low levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. No monetized water quality and other benefits are claimed. Qualitative benefits are ecosystem benefits from vegetation and sediment management, and water quality improvements due to a lack of flooding of agricultural lands.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within Hydrologic Region, Practice Integrated Flood Management, Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits and Expand Environmental Stewardship.